GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 7, 2002

- 1. Attendance See Attendance Sheet attachment.
- 2. Review and Acceptance of December 3, 2001 meeting minutes.

ACTION: A motion to approve the minutes of December 3, 2001, Committee meeting was made by Leonard Wien and seconded by Marty Hyman. Mr. Hyman asked that the minutes be revised to reflect a request for a report on the status of the CIP Programs hardware

and software.

Tim Hemstreet made some announcements: A Commission Workshop to talk about the entire Capital Improvement Project Program was scheduled to be held on Monday, January 14, 2002 in the Commission Chambers at 2pm.

Mr. Hemstreet also referred to an item that was brought up at the last GO Bond meeting on December 3, 2001, concerning the expired seats on the board. He explained that there was an item on the next Commission meeting, which will be held on January 9, 2002, to appoint people to the three (3) seats. Mayor Dermer confirmed this announcement.

- 3. Project Status Report
- (A) North Shore Park and Youth Center

Mr. Hemstreet explained that when the bids came back on the North Shore Park & Youth Center the project was short \$600,000 when comparing the bid against the available funding. He also explained that the Commission requested at the October 17, 2001 meeting that the Administration enter into a value engineering exercise as well as negotiations with lowest and best bidder to see if the Administration could close the gap in the funding and come out with a project that is within the funded the amount. He reported that the Administration finalized the value engineering exercise as well as the negotiations with the successful contractor. Mr. Hemstreet stated that at the December 19, 2001, City Commission meeting \$160,000 was approved from the CDBG funds for the project, that the Administration value engineered and negotiated \$260,000 in reductions with the contractor, and the contingency was reduced from 10% percent to 5% percent to address the \$600,000 funding deficit.

He explained that the value engineering components could take the form of either alternative construction methods or alternate materials in the youth center building or the park itself. He explained that the Commission would need to decide how the \$160,000 in CDBG funds would be spent between the two options available: (1) use roughly \$130,000 of the funds to replace some of the value engineering that was done in the youth center building or (2) accept the value engineering on the youth center components and use the funding to build four (4) tennis courts, bringing the total number of courts from the current sixteen (16) courts to the planned twelve (12) courts. The construction for the project should be able to begin in the 1st quarter of 2002.

Marty Hyman requested that any reductions in the total project not come from the youth center. Mr. Hemstreet responded that the youth center oversight committee had stated that same position. Mr. Hyman stated that if there is a funding shortage someplace, it makes more sense to reduce the open field and/or open facilities as oppose to reducing the program or the integrity of the materials in the youth center facility. The building components would be more difficult to revisit in the future than a playing field or some tennis courts.

(B) Marseille Drive

Mr. Hemstreet explained that on January 9, 2002 the City Commission would consider an item that would reassign the A/E contract to Gambach Architects, headed by one of the former partners of Gambach Sklar that had done the actual design work on Marseille Drive, due to the dissolution of the Gambach Sklar firm. He also explained that a portion of the work was designed inhouse, so Gambach Architects will be asked to oversee the construction administration portion of that part of the work. If the Commission approved the item, then the Administration could move on to the bidding process on the project.

There was discussion relative to the issue of non-performance under the contract and if there was a surety or guarantee for performance in place. Raul Aguila of the City Attorney's Office clarified the situation. He explained that the original firm of Gambach Sklar was dissolved and that one of the principles formed his own firm, Gambach Architects. The City had a provision in its contract with Gambach Sklar that if there was a need, the City could reassign the contract. This was what the Administration had chosen. There was no issue with non-performance.

Larry Herrup asked if Gambach Architects was going to be paid additional fees above and beyond the original contract. Mr. Hemstreet responded they would, because Gambach Architects was asked to perform the construction administration for portions of the project that were designed in-house by Public Works.

Professor LeJeune asked why on the project status report for both Lummus Park and South Pointe Park it says that the projects are on hold pending a request for additional reimbursable and survey expenses. Mr. Hemstreet responded that the contract with B&A is a long-standing contract, that the reimbursables were part of the original contract have been exhausted and the Administration is in the process of locating additional funds for the reimbursables to which B&A is in entitled. Mr. Hemstreet explained that the item would have to go Commission and was scheduled to be heard on January 30, 2002. After discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Hemstreet would work with Mr. Hyman before moving forward with the item.

Professor LeJeune asked why the project status report reads that both the Alton Road Corridor Enhancements and Flamingo Park projects have a higher GO Bond appropriations than budgeted. Kristin McKew, CIP Administrator, responded that on the Alton Road Corridor Enhancements project, the Administration had allocated more monies than originally intended for the A&E costs for the project. There had been a request brought to the GO Bond Committee a few meetings prior to recommend an appropriation of funds so that the City could apply for the Highway Beautification Grant, which the Committee and subsequently the Commission approved. The A&E fees were in addition to the \$15,000 that was already set aside for the A&E costs on the project. A similar situation occurred with the Flamingo Park project.

The City had to have a set of landscape drawings to be awarded the grant and those were not included in what was already part of the A&E contract. Mayor Dermer asked if the monies were there. Ms. McKew responded that the funds were being taken from the construction budget. Mayor Dermer expressed concern on this issue. Mr. Hemstreet explained that on the Alton Road Corridor Enhancements project the GO Bond allocation of \$819,000 has not been and will not be overspent.

Michael Rotbart inquired as to the funding breakdown of the Beach Planting project. Donald Shockey, Senior Capital Projects Planner responded that the intent is to take the funding component for the Beach Planting project, which is assigned to North Beach and include it to the North Beach Recreational Corridor project. Mr. Hemstreet said that a report would be requested for the next meeting.

Leonard Wien reflected that in the last two (2) years, the amount that has actually been spent is relatively negligible, but the City has actually committed through GO Bond appropriations approximately 19% percent of the \$92millon to the various projects.

Mr. Wien shared his belief that this year the City will see a tremendous increase in the percentage of funds that are appropriated because the Capital Improvement Project Office is in business and things are moving together in terms of coordinating the projects. Mr. Wien requested an additional report showing how much the City has actually spent on the GO Bond projects, and a report showing the amount of appropriations made year by year.

Mr. Hyman asked when the report would be available showing the CIP Office performance measurements, which include:

- ? Percentage of Neighborhood Streetscape Projects on Schedule
- ? Percentage of Parks Projects on Schedule
- ? Total Number of Projects within the Original Budget
- ? Total Percentage of Consultant and Contractor Payments Processed within twenty-five (25) Days
- ? Percentage of Total Project Change Orders that exceed 5% of Contingency

Mr. Hemstreet responded that the Administration is working on it and it would probably come out sometime before the end of the fiscal year.

Sherri Krassner asked the status of the 20th Street & Alton Road project. Mr. Hemstreet responded that is primarily a county project. Ms. Krassner asked if the City would be overseeing it to some extent. Robert Middaugh, Assistant to the City Manager, responded that Miami-Dade County is constructing this project and the City was promised that it would be under construction by the Fall of 2001. Miami-Dade County had to re-bid the project process and it has caused a delay. The start date to begin construction was delayed to January 2002. Ms. Krassner suggested that when construction does begin that there should be some traffic enforcement so that the traffic flows smoothly, and that the traffic light at Michigan and Alton be re-timed because it is a very long light and it would impede the traffic flow.

Michael Rotbart asked the status on Fire Station #4. Mr. Hemstreet responded that the Historic Preservation Board did designate that

site as a historic site. Mr. Hemstreet explained that the City is working to finalize the documents with the A&E firm MC Harry so the project can be scoped out. The Administration had a kick-off meeting with the appropriate parties to get the project moving again and move into schematic design. Nine (9) to twelve (12) months are required for design with construction following (hopefully breaking ground in a year).

A question was asked about the status of the Normandy Isle Park and Pool project. Roberto Sanchez asked if Corradino had any liability on the way the project was being handled. Mr. Hemstreet responded that he believed Corradino had no liability on the project, that the project itself is part of a contract that ended twenty-four (24) months ago. This project has a long history. The original contract was signed in 1997 or 1998, and was supposed to be a thirty (30) month contract to design three park projects. The original scope of the project contemplated a renovation of that facility and now there is a plan for a whole new facility for that site, including the demolition of the current facility and the construction of two (2) new pools.

William Cary, Planning Department, explained that the project was reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board probably two (2) to three (3) years ago. When the project began, it may have been a renovation of the original pool, but that at some point along the way, there was a decision made that the elevated pool was to be removed. It was suggested to bring the pool to grade level and a new facility be built at that location. He also explained that when the project was presented to the Design Review Board, it was a ground level pool and a larger complex surrounding the actual pool itself. Mr. Hemstreet explained that the project is significantly different from the original scope that was in the Corradino contract.

Mr. Sanchez asked if the funds are going to be located to build the project to the last design submitted by Corradino. Mr. Hemstreet responded that the Administration is in the process of trying to locate the funds.

(C) Updated Calendar of Scheduled Community Design Workshops

Mr. Hemstreet informed the committee that the majority of the Community Design Workshop(s) meetings are being changed from 6pm to 7pm at the request of the communities.

4. Recommendations to Appropriate Funds

(A) West Avenue/Bay Road Neighborhood Glatting Jackson A/E Contract Amendment

Mr. Hemstreet explained that the Administration had asked the Committee at the GO Bond meeting on December 3, 2001 to consider the fact that for some reason, the West Avenue/Bay Road Neighborhood was treated differently from any other neighborhood within the City. Mr. Hemstreet explained that the only areas that are included in the existing scope of that neighborhood are improvements to Bay Road and improvements along West Avenue. None of the side streets from 6^h Street to Lincoln Road where included within the scope of the neighborhood. He went on to say that the City is not able to give the community in that area any options for any improvements on any of the side streets.

For instance, one of the ideas that had been suggested in the first community design workshop meeting was to do a street-end improvement on 10th Street where it meets the bay. Right now, that area is not within the existing scope, so the A/E firm cannot consider making improvements there. The Administration believes very strongly that the remaining area needs to be placed within the scope of Glatting Jackson so the City is able to treat this neighborhood consistent with every other neighborhood in the City.

Professor LeJeune explained that he had voted against the recommendation at the last meeting because he understood that the Administration was talking about the side streets between Alton Road and West Avenue but agrees that the street-ends are an issue.

Mr. Hyman asked if the Committee voted to recommend allocation for the West Avenue/Bay Road project, if there were funds under the GO Bond to fund this project. Mr. Hemstreet responded that there were. The City would only construct what funding allowed for.

Mr. Herrup asked if it wouldn't make more sense to go to the community first, have them prioritize what they believe to be the most appropriate use of funds, and then design based on the use rather than having the designers come up with a plan which may not be used.

ACTION:

Mr. Wien made a motion to reconsider the allocation of \$22,247 in GO Bonds funds for Additional Services for the West Avenue/Bay Road Neighborhood project. Professor LeJeune seconded the motion. Two (2) committee members voted in favor and Eleven (11) members opposed. The motion failed.

Mr. Rotbart asked about where the monies go from impact fees paid by new high-rise buildings in the area. Larry Levy of the City Attorney's Office responded that the road impact fees go the County and the parking impact fees go to the City.

(B) Alton Road Corridor Enhancement Traffic Study

This item was removed from the agenda.

5. Informational Items

The Administration informed the Committee that the following Neighborhoods had their first Community Design Workshop(s) and that the majority of the future meetings are being changed from 6pm to 7pm at the request of the communities:

a. Nautilus ROW Improvements; **b**. Normandy Shores ROW Improvements; **c**. Bayshore; **d**. Flamingo/Lummus; **e**. La Gorce ROW Improvements.

The Committee was informed of the Parks Blue Ribbon Citizens Committee Town Hall Meetings regarding Parks and Recreational Programming. The Administration informed the Committee of the public meeting regarding the acquisition of the 777 17th Street Building, which may be the home for the CIP office.

Mr. Herrup asked the Administration to have a breakdown report at the next GO Bond meeting of the budget on the Capital Improvement Projects Office showing how much of GO Bond Funds and/or General Funds are being used to fund the office.

6. Change Orders

Mr. Hemstreet responded to a request from Mr. Hyman at the last GO Bond Oversight Committee meeting on December 3, 2001, regarding a memo that was in the agenda about the tracking of change orders. Mr. Hemstreet stated in the memo that compiling information about change orders is on a manual basis and that it is a cumbersome and slow process. Mr. Hemstreet explained that the statement was meant towards the change orders on the projects that have a GO Bond component that were initiated or in construction prior to 2001 (prior to the program managers coming on board). He explained that URS and Hazen & Sawyer do have

automated systems and the change orders that have been processed since they have come on board are within their systems. Mr. Hyman asked Bert Vidal of Hazen & Sawyer and Todd Osborn of URS if the software and hardware is up and running. Both gentlemen responded their companies were using the appropriate software.

Mr. Wien asked the status of the project website. Mr. Vidal responded that the website (www.cmbprojects.com) has been updated.

The Meeting adjourned at 8:46pm

JMG/RM/TH/KLM/JV

F:\WORK\\$ALL\JAQUE\00GOBOND\MINUTES\January 7 2002.doc